REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed February 27, 2008, claims 1-12 were rejected. Additionally, claim 12 was objected to. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and below-provided remarks. Claims 1, 7, 8, and 12 are amended. Claims 6 and 7 are canceled. Claims 13 and 14 are added. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments place the present application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal.

For reference, claims 1 and 12 are amended to clarify the limitation of turning off a buffer connected to a configurable circuit. Claim 12 is also amended to fix a minor grammatical error, as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 7 is amended to depend from claim 1, rather than claim 5, which is canceled, and to clarify the limitation of simultaneously switching off a section of buffers. Claim 8 is amended to depend from the claim 7, rather than claim 6, which is canceled. Claim 13 is added to recite limitations related to simultaneously switching off a section of buffers. Claim 14 is added to recite deriving a control signal from a most significant bit signal of a selection signal.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-8, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schultz et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,445,245, hereinafter Schultz). Additionally, claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz in view of Ajit (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0113628, hereinafter Ajit). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not anticipated by Schultz and are patentable over Schultz and Ajit for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claims 1 and 12

Claim 1, as amended, recites "adjusting means for switching off a buffer connected to the configurable circuit according to the determination of the applied load" (emphasis added). Claim 12 recites similar limitations.

In contrast, Schultz does not disclose means for switching off a buffer connected to a configurable circuit. Instead, Schultz generally describes adjusting a digitally controlled impedance to enable impedance matching with respect to a circuit connected to a pad driven by an output driver. Schultz, abstract. More specifically, Schultz describes enabling certain transistors from a set of transistors that are initially all turned off. Schultz, col. 7, line 56, to col. 8, line 24. Schultz further describes dynamically enabling transistors designated as "coarse" transistors and "fine" transistors in order to make a "coarse" tuning of the impedance matching and a "fine" tuning of the impedance matching. Schultz, col. 8, lines 37-65.

Although Schultz mentions an output driver 511 that dynamically enables/disables a component of a configurable circuit and mentions that an input buffer is connected to the output driver 511, Schultz does not disclose disabling a buffer of a configurable circuit. Rather, Schultz simply recognizes that enabling/disabling certain "coarse" and "fine" transistors can affect an output impedance of the configurable circuit. Disabling a transistor is different from switching off a buffer because there is no explanation of how disabling a transistor as described in Schultz would disable a buffer. Moreover, a transistor is not a buffer, so simply describing how to disable a transistor is insufficient to disclose how to disable a buffer. Thus, Schultz does not disclose means for switching off a buffer connected to a configurable circuit because Schultz merely discloses adjusting a digitally controlled impedance to enable impedance matching with respect to a circuit connected to a pad driven by an output driver.

Therefore, Schultz does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because Schultz does not disclose means for switching off a buffer connected to a configurable circuit, as recited in claim 1. Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 12 is not anticipated by Schultz at least for similar reasons to those stated above in regard to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claims 1 and 12 are not anticipated by Schultz because Schultz does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-4, 7-11, and 13-14 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 1 and 12. Applicants respectfully assert claims 2-

4, 7-11, and 13-14 are allowable based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of claims 2-4, 7-11, and 13-14 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

In regard to claims 7 and 13, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 and 13 are also patentable over Schultz because Schultz does not disclose all of the limitations of the claims. Claim 7 recites means for "generating at least one control signal for simultaneously switching off a section of buffers" (emphasis added). Claim 13 recites similar limitations. In contrast, Schultz merely discloses providing control signals for controlling transmission gates and transistors to "provide DCI output driver circuits with different impedances." Schultz, col. 14, line 32, to col. 15, line 21. However, Schultz does not disclose that the control signals might control a buffer. More specifically Schultz does not disclose that the control signals might control a section of buffers. Furthermore, it appears that Schultz is silent with regard to generating at least one control signal for simultaneously switching off a section of buffers. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 7 and 13 are not anticipated by Schultz because Schultz does not disclose "generating at least one control signal for simultaneously switching off a section of buffers," as recited in claims 7 and 13.

In regard to claims 8 and 14, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 14 are not anticipated by Schultz because Schultz does not disclose all of the limitations of the claims. Claim 8 recites means for "deriving said control signal from a most significant bit signal of a selection signal obtained from said determination means" (emphasis added). Claim 14 recites similar limitations. In contrast, Schultz merely discloses providing control signals for controlling transmission gates and transistors to "provide DCI output driver circuits with different impedances," as cited above. However, Schultz does not disclose that the control signals might be derived from a most significant bit signal. In fact, Schultz appears to be silent with regard to deriving a control signal from a most significant bit signal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 8 and 14 are not anticipated by Schultz because Schultz does not disclose "deriving said control signal from a most significant bit signal of a selection signal," as recited in claims 8 and 14.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: April 28, 2008

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111